



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

clw
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,602	09/22/2003	Paul S. Meissner	PF200D1C1	6731
22195	7590	06/16/2006	EXAMINER	
HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES INC.			SPECTOR, LORRAINE	
14200 SHADY GROVE ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850			1647	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,602

Applicant(s)

MEISSNER ET AL.

Examiner

Lorraine Spector, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, drawn to nucleic acids, vectors, host cells, and production of protein, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1 for example.
- II. Claim 12-13, drawn to a polypeptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claim 14-15, drawn to an antagonist of the protein which may be an antibody, classification dependent upon species.
- IV. Claims 16-18, drawn to assays for agonists or antagonists of the receptor for the disclosed polypeptide, classified in class 436, subclass 501.
- V. Claim 19, drawn to a diagnostic assay in which nucleic acids are analyzed, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- VI. Claim 20, drawn to a diagnostic assay involving a protein assay, classified in class 435, subclass 7.2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The polypeptide of Invention II is related to the nucleic acids of Invention I by virtue of encoding same. The DNA molecule has utility for the recombinant production of the protein in a host cell. Although the DNA molecules and proteins are related since the DNA encodes the specifically claimed protein, they are distinct inventions because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities, and the protein product can be made by another and materially different process, such as by synthetic peptide synthesis or purification from the natural source. Further, the DNA may be used for processes other than the production of the protein, such as nucleic acid hybridization assay as is encompassed by Invention V.

The nucleic acids, vectors, host cells, and methods of Invention I are separate and distinct from the antagonist of Invention III because the products of Invention I are of distinct structure

Art Unit: 1647

function and operation from the products of Invention III, and because the methods of Invention I neither make nor use the products of Inventions III. Accordingly, restriction is proper.

The products of Invention I are separate and distinct from the processes of Inventions IV and VI because the products are neither made by nor used in the processes. Accordingly, restriction is proper.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Groups I and IV-VI are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Invention I requires administration nucleic acid and involves expression of the protein encoded thereby, which is not required by any of the other groups. Invention IV assays for compounds that bind to the receptor that binds the protein of Invention II, said receptor not being required by any other group. Invention V requires measurement of nucleic acid mutations, which is not required by any of the other groups. Invention VI requires quantification of protein levels, which is not required by any of the other groups. Therefore, a search and examination of all three methods in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the searches for the three methods are not co-extensive, the classification is different, and the subject matter is divergent.

The products of Invention I are related to the assay of Invention V as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the products may be used for the production of the proteins of Invention II, and the processes of Invention V do not require the products of Invention I. Accordingly, restriction is proper.

The products of Inventions II and III are mutually exclusive sets of compounds which by definition do not overlap in scope. They must have different function, and different structure to provide that function, and therefore require separate search. Accordingly, restriction is proper.

Invention II is related to each of Inventions IV and VI as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1)

Art Unit: 1647

the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product may be used in either of the patentably distinct processes, or as an antigen for the production of the antibodies of Invention III.

Invention II is distinct from and unrelated to Invention V, wherein the polypeptide of Invention II is neither made by nor used in the methods of Invention V, and wherein each does not require the other.

Invention III is related to Invention IV as compound and method of identifying a compound. However, unlike a process of making a compound, the compound itself is not defined by the method of identifying it, and the search for the two inventions would be non-overlapping and burdensome. Accordingly, restriction is proper.

Invention III is distinct from and unrelated to Invention V, wherein the polypeptide of Invention III is neither made by nor used in the methods of Invention V, and wherein each does not require the other.

Inventions III and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process does not require the claimed product, and may be performed with a distinct compound that does not have the claimed agonist properties, but merely binds to the protein. Also, product may be used in distinct processes such as a method of treatment to inhibit the protein. Accordingly, restriction is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Art Unit: 1647

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Lorraine M. Spector. Dr. Spector can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. at telephone number 571-272-0893.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, please contact the Examiner's supervisor, Ms. Brenda Brumback, at telephone number 571-272-0961.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to **571-273-8300**. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to **571-273-0893**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Lorraine Spector, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner